

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 208

SP 026 819

AUTHOR Tannenbaum, Margaret D.
TITLE Faculty Development Practices in New Jersey Secondary and Post-Secondary Institutions.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985). Tables contain small print.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Faculty Development; *Postsecondary Education; *Private Schools; Program Effectiveness; *Public Schools; *Secondary Education; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Centra (John); *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire developed by John Centra was used in a nationwide survey done in 1975-76 to collect data on faculty development practices. This study used the same instrument to collect data on New Jersey secondary and post-secondary, public and private educational institutions. The data is used to compare: (1) the 1983-84 New Jersey data and the 1975-76 nationwide data collected by Centra; (2) secondary and post-secondary institutions; and (3) public and private secondary institutions. Frequency of faculty development use is analyzed by degree of perceived effectiveness. Tables summarize the following data collected from the survey: (1) the percentage of respondents which have each of the faculty development practices at their institutions, and the percentage which perceive them to be effective; (2) the rate of use and effectiveness for secondary and post-secondary institutions; (3) the rates of use and effectiveness for private and public secondary institutions; (4) comparisons of the nationwide data with the New Jersey data; (5) comparisons between secondary and post-secondary institutions by category; and (6) comparisons of public and private secondary institutions by category. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED264208

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES IN NEW JERSEY
SECONDARY AND POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Margaret D. Tannenbaum
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, N.J. 08028

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA
Chicago
1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Tannenbaum

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Sp # 026819

SUMMARY

Faculty Development Practices in New Jersey Secondary and Post-secondary Institutions

This study uses a questionnaire developed by John Centra in a nationwide survey done in 1975-76 to collect data on faculty development practices in New Jersey secondary and post-secondary, public and private educational institutions. It uses the data to make the following comparisons:

- (1) The 1983-84 New Jersey data and the 1975-76 nationwide data collected by Centra;
- (2) Secondary and Post-Secondary institutions;
- (3) Public and Private Secondary institutions.

In addition, it analyzes frequency of use by degree of perceived effectiveness and concludes that there is not a high correlation between use and perceived effectiveness of faculty development practices. When a trend emerges, as it did in the comparison between public and private secondary schools, there is an inverse relationship between use and effectiveness; public schools used more practices than private schools, but private schools perceived the practices they used to be more effective than did public schools.

Table I summarizes the data collected from the survey. The first section of the table (All) shows the percentage of respondents which have each of the practices at their institutions and the percentage which perceive it to be effective. The second section of the table similarly shows (and compares) the rates of use and effectiveness for secondary and post-secondary institutions. The third section provides the same information for private and public secondary institutions. Table II compares Centra's data with the New Jersey data --section II-A by item and section II-B by category. Table III compares secondary and post-secondary institutions by category and Table IV compares public and private secondary institutions by category.

Faculty Development Practices
in New Jersey Secondary and
Post-secondary Institutions

MARGARET D. TANNENBAUM
Glassboro State College

INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The question that this study was designed to address is: Does the public post-secondary sector of education have anything to learn from the secondary (public and/or private) sector of education about faculty development?

Although prior to the middle 1960s there were few college or university faculty development programs (Miller and Wilson, 1963; Many, Ellis, and Abrams, 1969; Eble, 1971), there was a substantial upsurge in faculty development practices during the early 1970's (Centra, 1976). In the last several years, however, due primarily to a decline in the availability of funding, it was hypothesized for this study that post-secondary faculty development programs had declined accordingly. Yet, because of growing retrenchment of post-secondary faculty and the increasing need for retraining, faculty development programs are needed more than ever.

In light of this and the recent attention given to the comparison of the quality of private and public secondary education (Coleman, 1981) and the 1983 report of the President's Commission on Excellence in Education (A Nation at Risk), this study was designed to collect data on public and private secondary school faculty development programs as a basis for comparison with those existing in post-secondary institutions.

A slightly modified version of the questionnaire (see attachment) used by John Centra in his 1975-76 nationwide study of faculty development practices in colleges and universities was mailed to all the public and private secondary schools, colleges, and universities in New Jersey. Of approximately 450 institutions receiving questionnaires (390 secondary, 60 post-secondary), 176 responded and 165 (147 secondary, 18 post-secondary) of these responses were usable in the study.

The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter addressed to the principal (secondary) or president (post-secondary) asking whether the institution "had an organized program or set of practices for faculty development and improving instruction." If so, the letter requested that the questionnaire be filled out by the person most knowledgeable about such programs or practices. The questionnaires were completed by a variety of people, including those addressed, other administrators, school psychologists and counsellors. Eleven uncompleted questionnaires were returned indicating that either the school was no longer in existence or the respondent considered the questionnaire too long to complete.

It was originally intended to make the following comparisons:

- a. The New Jersey post-secondary data and Centra's data;
- b. Secondary and post-secondary institutions;
- c. Public and private institutions within the secondary and post-secondary sectors.

However, despite two mailings (December of 1983 and February of

1984), only 18 New Jersey post-secondary institutions responded to the survey. Not only does this small number undermine the comparison with Centra's data, it also made it impossible to subdivide the New Jersey post-secondary sector into public and private and obtain any results from which general conclusions could be made. Therefore the section of this study which examines the public and private sector is limited to secondary institutions.

The modified Centra questionnaire lists and briefly describes 45 faculty development practices, which are grouped into five categories. The first four -- Workshops and Seminars; Analysis or Assessment Practices; Media, Technology, and Course Development; Miscellaneous -- are rated on a five-point scale on the basis of extent of faculty use and estimated effectiveness.* For the last category -- Institution-wide Practices -- respondents were to indicate whether or not the practice existed and then, as in the other categories, evaluate its effectiveness. In the following discussion I will be referring to these practices by groups, where relevant.

Before examining the outcomes of the study, it is important to point out the distinction between effectiveness and perceived effectiveness. Neither Centra's nor my study was intended to attempt to define, operationalize, or "test" for the effectiveness of faculty development programs. In the first place, the people who answered the questionnaire were not faculty, but "knowledgeable" administrators. In the second place, quantifying 'effectiveness' would certainly require some sort of reference to students and/or student perceptions and performances. Eliciting responses from either of these sources would require a very different kind of research effort than these. Rather, the intention of these studies was to report on the use and perceived effectiveness of a variety of practices by those assumed to be in a position to make an assessment. This is similar to the idea that on Family Feud contestants are asked to guess what respondents to the surveys will SAY is the case, not what IS the case.

Finally, the comparisons in this study are based on a difference of 15 percentage points to be considered worthy of notice and/or description and analysis.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Table I summarizes the data collected from the survey. The first section of the table (All) shows the percentage of respondents which have each of the practices at their institutions and the percentage which perceive it to be effective. The second section of the table similarly shows (and compares) the rates of use and effectiveness for secondary and

*A four-point scale of effectiveness was used: not very effective, somewhat effective, effective, and very effective. Respondents could also indicate that they had no idea of how effective a practice had been. The tables combine the last two responses; hereafter in the text 'effective' will also include very effective. This follows Centra's practice.

post-secondary institutions. The third section provides the same information for private and public secondary institutions.

The most outstanding general conclusion in this study is that there does not appear to be a high correlation between use and perceived effectiveness of faculty development programs. When a trend emerged, as it did in the comparison between public and private secondary schools, there was an inverse relationship between use and effectiveness. When examining the responses of the entire sample, it can be seen that of the 10 of the most frequently used practices, only 3 are also considered to be among the most effective. At the same time, of the 10 most frequently used practices, 3 are perceived to be among the LEAST effective practices. Conversely, of the 10 least used practices, 4 are among those perceived to be most effective. It would appear that some attempt should be made to concentrate expenditures for faculty development in those areas which would have the greatest return.

(1) COMPARISON OF 1983-84 DATA COLLECTED IN NEW JERSEY WITH 1975-76 NATIONWIDE DATA COLLECTED BY JOHN CENTRA. (Table II-A)

Although the sample of post-secondary institutions responding to this questionnaire was substantially smaller than the size of Centra's sample (18 versus 756), the percentage of responses to initial contacts was approximately the same (30% from New Jersey compared to 29% nationwide). However, because the sample size in this study is so small, it is difficult to determine whether it is sample size, the nature of the sample, or the intervening time period which accounts for variations in reported use and effectiveness of various practices. The assumption here is that the intervening time period accounts for at least some of the difference. Two kinds of comparisons were made with the data. The first examines which of the practices show positive or negative variations of 15 percentage points between Centra's data and mine. The second compares Centra's and the New Jersey data for those practices which are used the most by institutions and considered to be the most effective.

USE AND EFFECTIVENESS

As Table II-B shows, of the 45 practices assessed, the same number of items (5) show a negative difference in use as show a positive difference. Of those which show a negative difference, 4 are in the categories of workshops and analysis or assessment practices, one is an institution-wide practice. Those which show a positive difference are all in the category of institution-wide practices. They are:

- * Annual awards to faculty for excellence in teaching;
- * Sabbatical leaves with at least half salary;
- * A policy of unpaid leaves that covers educational or development purposes;
- * Temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area;
- * Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field.

Of these five, two also show a large positive difference in perceived effectiveness: annual awards (which Centra described more than once in his study to be perceived as one of the LEAST effective practices) and temporary teaching load reductions. In terms of overall perceived effectiveness, 20 of the 45 items

show a positive difference of 15 or more percentage points, while only 3 show a negative difference of 15 or more percentage points. The 20 showing a positive difference are distributed across all five categories. The 3 which show a significant negative difference in perceived effectiveness are all in the category of institution-wide practices:

- * A specific calendar period is set aside for professional development;
- * There is a periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not;
- * Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.

The first also shows a decline in use. Thus, it may be possible to tentatively conclude that while some faculty development practices have declined somewhat in extent of use (perhaps due to decreased funding), many have increased substantially in perceived effectiveness.

MOST USED AND MOST EFFECTIVE

As can further be seen by Table II-B, 7 of the 45 items in Centra's study and 13 of 45 in this study were described by 75% or more of the respondents as being used at their institutions. It would appear that some form of faculty development programs are (or are becoming) more wide-spread (at least in New Jersey.) Reinforcing the trend of an increase in perceived effectiveness, although NONE of the practices were perceived to be effective by 75% or more of those surveyed in Centra's study, 12 of the practices were perceived to be effective by 75% or more of those surveyed in this study. Of these 12, 5 were also used at 75% or more of the institutions responding. They were:

- A.2. Workshops, seminars, or short courses that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field;
- C.1. Specialists on campus to assist faculty in the use of audio-visual aids;
- C.2. Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid;
- D.1. Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching;
- II.8. Temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area;

There were two practices that were reported as being effective by 100% of those using them. They were: (1) simulated procedures which enable faculty to learn and practice specific teaching skills and (2) lighter than normal teaching load for first year faculty. It is perhaps ironic, however, that these were little used; use of simulated procedures was reported by 17% of the institutions and reduced teaching load by 11%.

(2) COMPARISON OF SECONDARY AND POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS. USE

As can be seen from Table III, secondary institutions used 18 practices more frequently than post-secondary institutions, while post-secondary used 11 practices more frequently than secondary. Although those used more frequently by secondary institutions were distributed throughout the five categories, they tended to be either group activities (6) like workshops and seminars or individual assessment practices that are mandated by law for public school teachers as a group (5). By contrast, of the 11 practices used more frequently by post-secondary

institutions, only two were NOT individual activities. Those were visiting scholars program and a committee on faculty development.

EFFECTIVENESS

Secondary institutions report 8 practices are perceived as more effective than post-secondary; postsecondary institutions report 8 (different) practices as more effective than secondary. For secondary institutions these practices are found in all of the categories except Media, Technology, Course Development, while for post-secondary institutions this is the category where most of the more effective practices are found. It is interesting to note that all of the practices in this category have increased in perceived effectiveness by post-secondary institutions since Centra's study, except one --C.7: Special Professional Library Readily Accessible to Faculty. However, none have increased substantially in use.

Two of the practices cited by secondary institutions as effective by 15 or more percentage points bear comment. Centra pointed out that one practice which was little used but seen as effective by the vast majority of users is the growth contract (B.10). In this study 65% of the secondary respondents use this practice, with perceived effectiveness at 100%. By comparison, only 45% of post-secondary institutions report using it, with perceived effectiveness at 62%.

The second comment-worthy practice cited as both widely used and highly effective is the periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not. It is used by 91% of the secondary institutions and perceived as effective by 80% of those using it. By contrast, although 72% of the post-secondary institutions report using the practice, only 33% perceive it to be effective. This is a negative difference in perceived effectiveness of 26 points since Centra's study.

Future research might address the differences in the culture of the secondary and post-secondary institutions that account for the differences in perceived effectiveness of these related practices.

MOST USED AND MOST EFFECTIVE

In the case of both secondary and post-secondary institutions there are 13 practices (distributed across all 5 categories) which 75% or more report using, with 5 of these being common to both types of institutions. These 5 are:

- * Workshops or presentations that explore various methods or techniques of instruction;
- * Workshops, seminars, or short courses that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field;
- * Faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on teaching or course improvement;
- * Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid;
- * Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.

Among secondary institutions only 7 practices are reported as perceived to be effective by 75% or more of the respondents and 3 of the 7 involve grants or travel funds. Two of the remaining 7 have already been mentioned: growth contracts and periodic review. The most interesting other practice cited as effective is master teachers or senior faculty to work closely with new or

apprentice teachers (B.9). This practice is reported as used by 65% of secondary institutions and perceived as effective 75% of the time. By way of comparison, although the use at post-secondary institutions is only 33%, the perception of effectiveness is similar to that at secondary institutions -- 72%. One wonders why this practice is not used more at the post-secondary level.

As mentioned previously, at the post-secondary level 12 practices were perceived to be effective by 75% or more of the respondents. These fall in every category except Analysis or Assessment Practices. It is interesting to note that the third most frequently used practice -- Systematic ratings of instruction by students -- is perceived as the fourth least effective practice. In addition, it is odd that although 3 of the practices in this category are reported as used by 75% or more of the institutions, none are seen as effective by 75% or more of the users. Once again, one wonders. Why are the most individually-oriented practices, those which we would expect to be the most effective, NOT perceived to be effective by post-secondary institutions?

There are only two practices at the secondary level that are reported to be both used and effective by 75% or more of the institutions. They are periodic review of faculty and travel funds to attend professional conferences.

There are 5 practices at the post-secondary level that are reported to be both used and effective by 75% or more of the institutions. They were listed earlier in the section comparing the New Jersey data with Centra's data.

3. COMPARISON OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS.

(Table IV)

USE

A dominant trend emerges in the analysis of public and private institutions. Although public institutions report substantially greater usage of faculty development practices, private institutions report substantially greater perceived effectiveness.

Of the 45 practices assessed, public institutions used 16 of the practices more than private institutions and these were distributed across all 5 categories. Private institutions used only 5 of the practices more. Of these 5, 3 were analysis or assessment practices, one was personal counseling provided for individual faculty members, and one was the setting aside of a specific calendar period for professional development.

EFFECTIVENESS

As indicated, effectiveness presents the opposite picture. Using the 15 point criterion, the contrast is great. Public institutions perceive 4 practices to be more effective than private schools perceive them to be, while private schools perceive 23 practices to be more effective than do public schools. Although practices perceived more effective by private institutions are distributed across all 5 categories, there are none perceived as more effective by public institutions in the categories of workshops or miscellaneous practices.

MOST USED AND MOST EFFECTIVE

This picture continues when examining those practices used and

perceived as effective by 75% or more of the respondents. Among public institutions 14 practices were used at this rate; among private only 6 were. However, among public institutions only 5 practices were perceived to be effective by 75% or more of the respondents, while among private 24 practices were.

Generally speaking, it appears that public schools use many more practices than private schools but with substantially less perceived effectiveness. I would propose that there are at least two possible explanations for this. The explanation for the disparity in use is likely found in economic factors; public schools have more money to spend on these activities than private schools do. The opposite disparity in perceived effectiveness might well be explained by the economic factor combined with the difference in perspective between public and private school educators; those working in private schools are likely to be more homogenous and have a greater vested interest in faculty development than those in public schools.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The hypothesis that faculty development practices had substantially declined since the mid-seventies was not confirmed. Only 5 out of 45 practices have shown decline, but as many have shown an increase in use. However, perceived effectiveness of large number of practices has increased.
2. The two practices at the post-secondary level which were reported as 100% effective were among the least used. They were: simulated procedures which enable faculty to learn and practice specific teaching skills (used 17%) and lighter than normal teaching load for first year faculty (used 11%).
3. Two practices which are perceived as among the most effective at the secondary level are perceived as among the least effective at the post-secondary level. They are growth contracts and periodic review of all faculty whether tenured or not. Future research might attempt to discover the explanation for these differences.
4. The comparison of public and private secondary institutions reveals that public schools use far more faculty development practices, but private schools perceive the ones they use to be substantially more effective than do public schools.
5. In general, it would appear that public post-secondary institutions should consider incorporating fewer, more individually-oriented faculty development practices that concentrate on improving specific classroom teaching skills.

TABLE I -- GENERAL COMPARISONS

A. Workshops, Seminars, Programs (Disregard box at left of each practice until you reach Part III of the questionnaire.

1. Workshops or presentations that explore various methods or techniques of instruction.
2. Workshops, seminars, or short courses that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field.
3. Workshops or seminars dealing with new or different approaches to develop curricula.
4. Workshops or seminars on testing and evaluating student performance.
5. Workshops, seminars, or program to acquaint faculty with goals of the institution and types of students enrolled.
6. Workshops or program to help faculty improve their academic advising and counseling skills.
7. Workshops or seminars to help faculty improve their research and scholarship skills.
8. Workshops, seminars, or program to improve the management of departmental operations.
9. Workshops or presentations that explore general issues or trends in education.
10. Workshops or program in faculty affective development--improving their interpersonal skills or their ability to work effectively in groups, exploring educational values, and similar topics.

ALL (n=165)		TYPE OF INSTITUTION SEC (n=147)		POST-SEC (n=18)		TYPE OF CONTROL PUBLIC (n=101)		PRIVATE (n=30)*	
USE %	EFF %	USE %	EFF %	USE %	EFF %	USE %	EFF %	USE %	EFF %
91	65	91	66	78	57	87	63	90	74
87	72	86	71	78	75	85	70	70	76
86	56	86	56	67	46	81	59	80	63
85	43	82	43	39	43	84	42	70	48
78	70	78	72	61	55	77	69	70	71
72	54	68	53	72	63	63	45	63	84
43	41	40	39	39	57	33	33	43	54
68	51	65	52	50	80	68	51	37	73
75	56	74	54	67	67	69	46	70	76
65	51	63	50	39	57	58	44	57	71

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analysis or Assessment Practices

1. Systematic ratings of instruction by students used to help faculty improve.
2. Formal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement (i.e., visitations or use of assessment form).
3. Informal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement.
4. Systematic teaching or course evaluations by an administrator for improvement purposes.
5. System for faculty to assess their own strengths and areas needing improvement.
6. Classroom visitation by an instructional resource person (i.e., a development specialist), upon request, followed by a diagnosis of teaching.
7. Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction.
8. Faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on teaching or course improvement.
9. "Master teachers" or senior faculty work closely with new or apprentice teachers.
10. Professional and personal development plan (sometimes called a growth contract) for individual faculty members.

49	43	42	53	89	38	33	30	50	53
57	61	51	64	50	60	44	52	60	78
70	60	65	67	78	59	54	53	77	74
88	74	86	70	56	74	85	73	80	79
67	52	67	62	50	51	65	47	67	75
53	70	54	40	33	72	57	71	27	100
44	59	36	50	33	60	22	100	17	80
80	68	78	69	78	68	76	61	67	90
64	83	65	75	33	72	65	65	63	90
66	62	65	100	45	62	77	60	27	75

TABLE 1 — Continued

	ALL (n=165)		TYPE OF INSTITUTION SEC (n=147)		POST-SEC (n=18)		TYPE OF CONTROL PUBLIC (n=101)		PRIVATE (n=30)	
	USE %	EFF %	USE %	EFF %	USE %	EFF %	USE %	EFF %	USE %	EFF %
C. Media, Technology, Course Development										
1. Specialists on campus to assist faculty in use of audiovisual aids in instruction, including closed-circuit television.	75	93	71	76	83	86	77	80	33	50
2. Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid (e.g., programmed learning or computer-assisted instruction).	79	73	76	73	78	75	82	72	47	64
3. Specialists to assist faculty in constructing tests or evaluating student performance.	46	58	46	55	39	86	47	65	27	63
4. Specialists to assist individual faculty in instructional or course development by consulting on course objectives and course design.	59	69	60	68	28	80	63	66	43	67
5. Specialists to help faculty develop teaching skills such as lecturing or leading discussions, or to encourage use of different teaching-learning strategies such as individualized instruction.	57	57	57	55	39	71	59	52	27	88
6. Simulated procedures which enable faculty to learn and practice specific teaching skills (e.g., micro-teaching).	24	50	24	49	17	100	24	50	13	25
7. Special professional library readily accessible to faculty dealing with instructional methodology, teaching skills, psychology of learning, and similar topics.	80	42	79	42	56	38	79	40	63	53
D. Miscellaneous Practices										
1. Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching.	69	61	65	59	83	79	66	55	43	69
2. Visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of this institution) to review educational programs or innovative projects.	96	68	95	70	72	50	90	69	93	75
3. Faculty exchange program with other institutions.	15	64	13	63	22	50	10	60	17	80
4. Faculty take courses offered by colleagues.	59	72	54	73	78	56	56	70	27	88
5. Personal counseling provided individual faculty members on career goals, and other personal development areas.	40	61	37	61	39	67	30	48	50	93

TABLE 1— CONTINUED

Practice

(If you would like to comment about any practice, please do so below.)

1. Annual awards to faculty for excellence in teaching.
2. Circulation of newsletter, articles, etc. that are pertinent to teaching improvement or faculty development.
3. A specific calendar period is set aside for professional development.
4. There is a periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not.
5. Sabbatical leaves with at least half salary.
6. A policy of unpaid leaves that covers educational or development purposes.
7. Lighter than normal teaching load for first year faculty.
8. Temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area.
9. Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field.
10. Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.
11. Visiting scholars program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods.
12. Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses.
13. There is a campus committee on faculty development.

25	41	20	39	56	50	21	33	10	33
80	52	80	52	61	56	72	53	80	46
65	51	69	49	28	17	36	89	77	57
91	79	91	80	72	33	88	81	73	73
58	60	53	58	89	71	55	53	13	10
50	58	44	57	94	56	36	53	7	10
43	100	34	67	11	100	0	0	3	10
33	75	27	69	83	80	26	73	23	71
25	74	20	77	67	64	15	67	23	10
86	78	82	77	100	12	81	73	70	86
28	75	18	74	50	75	16	69	7	10
48	87	46	87	56	78	48	85	27	10
44	67	40	65	61	70	29	66	33	60

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A. Workshops, Seminars, Programs (Disregard box at left of each practice until you reach Part III of the questionnaire.)

1. Workshops or presentations that explore various methods or techniques of instruction.
2. Workshops, seminars, or short courses that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field.
3. Workshops or seminars dealing with new or different approaches to develop curricula.
4. Workshops or seminars on testing and evaluating student performance.
5. Workshops, seminars, or program to acquaint faculty with goals of the institution and types of students enrolled.
6. Workshops or program to help faculty improve their academic advising and counseling skills.
7. Workshops or seminars to help faculty improve their research and scholarship skills.
8. Workshops, seminars, or program to improve the management of departmental operations.
9. Workshops or presentations that explore general issues or trends in education.
10. Workshops or program in faculty affective development--improving their interpersonal skills or their ability to work effectively in groups, exploring educational values, and similar topics.

CENTRA		NEW JERSEY	
USE	EFF	USE	EFF
%		%	

88	57	78	57
72	59	78	75
72	50	67	46
63	45	39	43
72	53	61	55
65	44	72	63
34	35	39	57
48	51	50	80
66	38	67	67
60	49	39	57

B. Analysis or Assessment Practices

1. Systematic ratings of instruction by students used to help faculty improve.
2. Formal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement (i.e., visitations or use of assessment form).
3. Informal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement.
4. Systematic teaching or course evaluations by an administrator for improvement purposes.
5. System for faculty to assess their own strengths and areas needing improvement.
6. Classroom visitation by an instructional resource person (i.e., a development specialist), upon request, followed by a diagnosis of teaching.
7. Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction.
8. Faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on teaching or course improvement.
9. "Master teachers" or senior faculty work closely with new or apprentice teachers.
10. Professional and personal development plan (sometimes called a growth contract) for individual faculty members.

96	50	89	38
64	47	50	60
74	40	78	59
64	53	56	74
66	57	50	51
37	54	33	72
60	59	33	60
70	61	78	68
45	59	33	72
36	63	45	62

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Media, Technology, Course Development

1. Specialists on campus to assist faculty in use of audiovisual aids in instruction, including closed-circuit television.
2. Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid (e.g., programmed learning or computer-assisted instruction).
3. Specialists to assist faculty in constructing tests or evaluating student performance.
4. Specialists to assist individual faculty in instructional or course development by consulting on course objectives and course design.
5. Specialists to help faculty develop teaching skills such as lecturing or leading discussions, or to encourage use of different teaching-learning strategies such as individualized instruction.
6. Simulated procedures which enable faculty to learn and practice specific teaching skills (e.g., micro-teaching).
7. Special professional library readily accessible to faculty dealing with instructional methodology, teaching skills, psychology of learning, and similar topics.

D. Miscellaneous Practices

1. Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching.
2. Visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of this institution) to review educational programs or innovative projects.
3. Faculty exchange program with other institutions.
4. Faculty take courses offered by colleagues.
5. Personal counseling provided individual faculty members on career goals, and other personal development areas.

Practice

(If you would like to comment about any practice, please do so below.)

1. Annual awards to faculty for excellence in teaching.
2. Circulation of newsletter, articles, etc. that are pertinent to teaching improvement or faculty development.
3. A specific calendar period is set aside for professional development.
4. There is a periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not.
5. Sabbatical leaves with at least half salary.
6. A policy of unpaid leaves that covers educational or development purposes.
7. Lighter than normal teaching load for first year faculty.
8. Temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area.
9. Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field.
10. Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.
11. Visiting scholars program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods.
2. Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses.
1. There is a campus committee on faculty development.

CENTRAL USE EFF % NEW CENTER USE EFF %

81 66 83 86

74 56 78 75

39 51 39 86

33 63 28 80

47 57 39 71

31 45 17 100

66 37 56 38

81 71 83 79

86 58 72 50

27 45 22 50

73 50 78 56

44 50 39 67

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

38 28 ✓ 56 ✓ 50

68 27 61 56

44 52 28 -17

78 59 72 -33

67 66 ✓ 89 71

72 51 ✓ 94 56

21 64 11 100

61 64 ✓ 83 ✓ 80

52 64 ✓ 67 64

93 62 100 -12

55 57 50 75

58 70 56 78

61 50 61 70

TABLE II-B -- COMPARISON OF CENTRA'S STUDY/N.J. BY CATEGORIES

	USE BY 15			EFF BY 15		
	CENTRA	N. J.	SAME	CENTRA	N. J.	SAME
A	2	0		0	5	1
B	2	0		0	3	
C	0	0	1	0	5	
D	0	0		0	1	
II	0	5	1	3	6	1
TOT	5	5	2	3	20	2

	USED BY 75% OR MORE		EFF BY 75% OR MORE		USED/EFF BY 75% OR MORE	
	CENTRA	N. J.	CENTRA	N. J.	CENTRA	N. J.
A	1	2	0	2	0	1
B	1	3	0	0	0	0
C	1	2	0	5	0	2
D	2	2	0	1	0	1
II	2	4	0	4	0	1
TOT	7	13	0	12	0	5

TABLE III -- COMPARISON OF SECONDARY AND POST-SECONDARY

	USE BY 15			EFF BY 15		
	SEC	P-S	SAME	SEC	P-S	SAME
A	5	0		1	2	1
B	5	1	1	2	1	
C	3	0		0	3	
D	1	2		2	1	
II	4	8		3	1	
TOT	18	11	1	8	8	1

	USED BY 75% OR MORE		EFF BY 75% OR MORE		USED/EFF BY 75% OR MORE	
	SEC	P-S	SEC	P-S	SEC	P-S
A	5	2	0	2	0	1
B	2	3	2	0	0	0
C	2	2	1	5	0	2
D	1	2	0	1	0	1
II	3	4	4	4	2	1
TOT	13	13	7	12	2	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE IV -- COMPARISON OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

	USE BY 15			EFF BY 15		
	PUB	PRIV	SAME	PUB	PRIV	SAME
A	2	0	1	0	5	
B	2	3		1	8	
C	6	0		2	1	
D	2	1		0	3	
II	4	1		1	6	1
TOT	16	5	1	4	23	1

USED	BY 75% OR MORE		EFF	BY 75% OR MORE		USED/EFF	BY 75% OR MORE	
	PUB	PRIV		PUB	PRIV		PUB	PRIV
A	5	2	0	3	0	0	0	0
B	3	1	1	8	0	0	1	1
C	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
D	1	1	0	4	0	0	1	1
II	2	2	3	8	1	1	0	0
TOT	14	6	5	24	1	1	2	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Centra, John A. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES IN U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, November, 1976.
- _____. "Faculty Development in Higher Education." TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD. 80(1978), 188-201.
- _____. "Plusses and Minuses for Faculty Development." CHANGE, 1977, 47-64+.
- _____. "Types of Faculty Development Programs." JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION. 49(1978), 151-162.
- Coleman, James S.; Hoffer, Thomas; & Kilgore, Sally. PUBLIC, CATHOLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS COMPARED. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
- _____. "Public and Private Schools." CHRONICLES OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 22(1981), 12+.
- Dingerson, Michael R. "Internal Research Programs in Colleges and Universities." JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 48(1977), 283-293.
- Eble, K. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE TEACHER. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, November 1971.
- Many, W.A.; Ellis, J.R.; & Abrams, P. IN-SERVICE EDUCATION IN AMERICAN SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: A STATUS REPORT. DeKalb: College of Education, Northern Illinois University, 1969.
- Miller, W.S. & Wilson, K.W. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES IN SMALL COLLEGES. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.
- Nelsen, W.C. "Faculty Development: Prospects and Potential for the 1980's." LIBERAL EDUCATION, 65(1979), 141-149.
- Smart, J.C. "Diversity of Academic Organizations; Faculty Incentives." JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 49(1978), 403-419.
- Sullivan, L.L. "Faculty Development: A Movement on the Brink." COLLEGE BOARD REVIEW, 127(1983), 20-21+.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE